

Chapter 1

Introduction, Purpose and Need For Action

1.0 Introduction and History

The Hanford Reach National Monument/Saddle Mountain National Wildlife Refuge (Monument), located near the Tri-Cities (Kennewick, Pasco, and Richland) in south-central Washington State, is one of the newest additions to the NWRS and is managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the Department of Energy (DOE) (see Maps 1 and 2). Its national monument status is the result of a long series of events, culminating in numerous overlying current designations, including the national monument designation (see Chapter 3 for a discussion of these designations and distinctions).

The land comprising the Monument has an unusual and colorful provenance. The entry of the United States into World War II and the race to develop an atomic bomb led to a search for a suitable place to locate plutonium production and purification facilities. In 1943, the War Department (later to become the Department of Defense) went in search of a remote, easily defensible, geologically stable site, with plenty of cool water, abundant energy (from hydropower dams on the Columbia River), and a moderate climate, on which to build secret plutonium production reactors. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE) selected a site in Washington State near the isolated desert towns of White Bluffs and Hanford. The War Department then acquired the land through condemnation and purchase of private lands and withdrawal of public lands within the basin formed by Rattlesnake Mountain and the Saddle Mountains. The Atomic Energy Commission (AEC), a precursor to the DOE, then established and ran the Hanford Site (then known as the Hanford Engineering Works).

For more than forty years, the primary mission at the Hanford Site was the production of nuclear materials for national defense. During that time, management activities and development practices were driven by needs related to nuclear production, chemical processing, waste management, and research and development. The AEC, and later the DOE, developed infrastructure and facility complexes to accomplish this work in the central portion of the site, but large tracts of land used as protective buffer zones for safety and security purposes remained undisturbed. These buffer zones preserved a nationally significant biological and cultural resource setting in the Columbia Basin region, unique in that similar resources elsewhere in the Columbia Basin have been destroyed or replaced by development.

In the early 1970s, there was a reduced need for large safety and security buffer zones around the Hanford Site, and the DOE transferred management of portions of the “North” or “Wahluke Slope” (the area north of the Columbia River) to the FWS—through the creation of the Saddle Mountain National Wildlife Refuge—and to the Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW). By the late 1980s, the primary DOE mission had changed from defense materials production to environmental restoration, waste management, and science and technology research, further decreasing the need for a large land base. In 1997, the DOE transferred the administration of the Fitzner-Eberhardt Arid Lands Ecology Reserve (ALE) to the FWS. In 1999, the Wahluke Slope lands managed by the WDFW, known as the Wahluke

Wildlife and Recreation Area, were transferred to the FWS to be managed under DOE permit as part of the NWRS. The WDFW retained administration of the area around the Vernita Bridge under DOE permit to provide access for sport fishing on the Columbia River.

In the 1980s, concerns for protection of the Hanford Site's natural and cultural resource values grew, as did interest in consolidating management under one natural resource agency. In 1988, Congress directed the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Energy to identify and evaluate the outstanding features of the Hanford Reach and its immediate environment—including fish, wildlife, geology, scenery, recreation, historic and cultural values—and recommend alternatives for their preservation. The resulting Department of the Interior (DOI) report, the *Hanford Reach of the Columbia River Comprehensive River Conservation Study and Environmental Impact Statement* (National Park Service 1994), identified the FWS as best suited to protect those values and the lands necessary to support them. After years of discussion and controversy, the question of protection was settled when President Clinton created the Monument (Proclamation 7319) through his powers under the American Antiquities Act.

The Monument is also unique in its complexity and its management; it is the only national monument managed by the DOE and one of only two managed by the FWS.⁴ The Monument is superimposed over approximately 195,000 acres of the 586-square-mile DOE Hanford Site. The DOE currently administers approximately 29,000 acres of land within the Monument and retains land surface ownership or control on all acreage.⁵ Approximately 165,000 acres are currently managed by the FWS through its authorities under the National Wildlife Refuge System Management Act (16 United States Code § 668dd–ee) and through agreements with the DOE.⁶ The WDFW administers approximately 800 acres of the Monument through a permit with the DOE (see Maps 3 and 4). Other state and federal agencies and utility districts maintain rights-of-way or manage small tracts of land within the Monument boundaries.

Presidential Proclamation 7319 directs that the “. . . monument shall be managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under existing agreements with the Department of Energy, except that the Department of Energy shall manage the lands within the monument that are not subject to management agreements with the [FWS], and in developing any management plans and rules and regulations governing the portions of the monument for which the Department of Energy has management responsibility, the Secretary of Energy shall consult with the Secretary of the

⁴ On June 15, 2006, President Bush established the nearly 140,000-square-mile Northwestern Hawaiian Islands Marine National Monument. The FWS manages portions of this newest national monument.

⁵ The DOE retains administrative control pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and applicable public land orders.

⁶ These Monument lands are administered as an “overlay refuge.” Overlay refuges exist where the FWS manages lands for the benefit of fish and wildlife resources, but where it is not the primary holder in fee title of lands forming the refuge.

Interior.” Thus, the FWS and DOE have joint management responsibility of the Monument. However, it was agreed that the FWS would be the lead agency in preparing this Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) and associated environmental impact statement (EIS).

The FWS and DOE together fulfill several missions at the Hanford Site. The FWS is responsible for the protection and management of the Monument’s resources and the management of people and their access to Monument lands under FWS control. The FWS also has the responsibility to protect threatened and endangered species, administer the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and protect fish, wildlife and trust resources within and beyond the boundaries of the Monument. The DOE is responsible for protecting the resources of the Monument, managing energy research, and remediating wastes remaining from weapons material production. The DOE also administers agreements and permits with other entities, such as the Washington Department of Transportation (WSDOT), U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), South Columbia Basin Irrigation District (SCBID), Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Energy Northwest, adjacent counties, and others to enable these entities to fulfill their missions in energy production, energy distribution, communications, transportation and irrigation. Because the DOE has primary jurisdiction, it retains approval authority over certain management aspects of the Monument. This includes approval of the final CCP/EIS and approval of access granted to tribes.

1.1 Purpose and Need

The FWS needs to establish a CCP to guide management of Monument resources, programs and visitors for the next fifteen years and likely beyond that. The National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (Improvement Act) requires that all national wildlife refuges be managed in accordance with an approved CCP by 2012. An approved CCP would and must provide guidance for management of the Monument consistent with the Presidential Proclamation that established it. Specifically, the FWS needs to adopt and implement a final CCP with the following management guidance.

- Protect and restore biological, cultural, geological and paleontological resources.
- Identify compatible activities and uses, with an emphasis upon wildlife-dependent public uses.
- Identify the overall need for, and distribution of, visitor facilities, including public access and transportation routes.
- Identify areas of the Monument open to the public, areas open by permit, and areas closed to protect natural and cultural resources and the cultural traditions of Native American tribes.

- Provide for the protection of the eligibility of the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River as a national wild and scenic river.
- Provide a basis for budget requests to support needs for Monument staffing, operations, maintenance and capital improvements.
- Provide a set of decisions that outline management direction and create a framework for future planning, decision-making, and coordination with other affected stakeholders.

1.2 Proposed Action

The FWS proposes to adopt and implement a CCP for the Monument. The CCP process has been lengthy due to the high level of public, agency and tribal involvement and the complex management issues associated with the Monument. (See Chapter 5 for a detailed explanation of the CCP process.) The involvement of so many interested parties, however, has led to a thorough, well-focused range of alternatives for future management of the Monument. All eight alternatives, (A, B, B-1, C, C-1, D, E and F) protect, to various levels, resources identified in the Monument Proclamation; provide for public use of the Monument; address major issues and relevant mandates; and are consistent with principles of sound natural and cultural resource management. Chapter 2 outlines the eight alternatives.

1.2.1 *Final CCP Components*

This document, while called a “final CCP” for the sake of clarity and brevity is actually much larger and more involved than what the actual final CCP will look like. This document looks at a broad range of management alternatives and their reasonably foreseeable impacts to the environment. The actual final document—the “final CCP”—will be comprised of various components from the final CCP/EIS. In other words, after this final CCP/EIS is issued, and a final decision on management is made through the signing of a Record of Decision (ROD), the appropriate components of the final CCP/EIS will be incorporated into a concise management plan devoid of the other alternatives, background information, environmental impacts, etc. This will be the document that managers will use to administer the Monument. The components that may be included in this final document include:

- The Monument’s vision statement.
- Enough background information from Chapters 1 and 3 and the Appendices to provide a snapshot of the Monument and its resources.

- A description of the selected management alternative and the goals, objectives and implementation strategies from Chapter 2 directly related to the selected alternative.
- A description of monitoring and other implementation programs.
- Relevant maps.
- Compatibility determinations.
- A list of completed and needed step-down plans.
- A schedule for plan revision.

1.2.2 Environmentally Preferred Alternative

The concept of the “environmentally preferable alternative” is different from that of “preferred alternative,” although in some cases one alternative may be both. The environmentally preferred alternative is generally the one that causes the least damage to the environment and best protects natural and cultural resources. However, as noted below, the FWS must balance many different parameters—and meet its mission and statutory requirements—in selecting a preferred alternative. Due to its focus on protection and the allocation of resources to restoration, Alternative B-1 is the environmentally preferred alternative.

1.2.3 Preferred Alternative

The preferred alternative is the alternative which the agency believes would fulfill its statutory mission and responsibilities, giving consideration to environmental, social, economic, technical and other factors. All alternatives meet the primary purposes of the Monument Proclamation and the mission of the NWRS and therefore have the potential to be selected as a final management plan. The FWS has chosen Alternative C-1 as its preferred alternative (see Chapter 2 for a full description of the alternative). Alternative C-1 attempts to strike a balance between resource protection and the level of public use and access the public expects.

1.3 Planning Area

The geographic scope of decisions in this CCP/EIS includes all publicly owned lands and waters within the boundaries of the Monument and within the national wild and scenic river study area

(see Maps 3 and 4). All islands within the Hanford Reach of the Columbia River, both those within the Monument boundary and those managed by the FWS in close proximity, are also included in this CCP; these islands will be administered/managed by the Monument. Some areas immediately adjacent to the Monument are also discussed in this EIS if they will be affected by the plan or if they influence management or affect resources of the Monument.

Several different agencies have management jurisdiction over Monument lands and waters; the intent, therefore, is to produce a CCP that applies to all Monument lands. The FWS will work with these other jurisdictions to protect Monument resources consistent with the CCP. Following the release of this final CCP/EIS, each of the primary managing federal agencies could prepare their own ROD on this EIS to manage resources under their jurisdiction. The DOE, the other principal managing agency of the Monument, has indicated it may prepare its own ROD on this EIS.

1.4 Step-Down Plans

CCPs are intended to provide a framework for management direction. As such, they often take a broad view of a refuge, leaving finer details to other subsequent plans. Additional plans stemming from a CCP are known as step-down plans (FWS 2000, Refuge Manual 602 FW 4). The CCP provides the framework and priorities for management, and the step-down plans provide management detail. Step-down management plans allow the planning process to be tiered and broken into a manageable effort.

The use of the CCP as a broad planning umbrella is especially relevant for the Monument. The Monument is a large, complex land area that faces a multitude of complex issues and has a wide range of competing interests. This complexity, coupled with the newness of the Monument, the lack of an existing CCP to use as a basis, and a shortage of biological and cultural information, necessitates the development of numerous step-down plans.

The FWS considers this CCP to be a landscape-scale plan, whereby general management direction is set but details for the management of programs are left to be determined in subsequent plans. For example, this CCP determines which areas are generally suitable for the establishment of trails, but the exact location, design and uses of those trails will be determined in a step-down visitor services or trail plan.

Several resource areas and issues will be addressed in subsequent step-down plans. A few of these plans currently exist in some form, although the selection of a preferred management alternative may necessitate their revision. For example, the Wildland Fire Management Plan (2001) may need to be revised based on changes in visitor use patterns, new areas open, or additional land designations (e.g., the possible designation of the B Reactor as a national

historical site). The Invasive Plant Species Inventory and Management Plan (IPSIMP) was made for public review and comment at the same time as the draft CCP and will be finalized following signature of the CCP ROD. In addition to the IPSIMP and Wildland Fire Management Plan, existing, likely and possible step-down plans include, but are not limited to:

- Cultural Resources Management
- Fishing
- Habitat Management
- Hunting
- Interpretation and Education
- Integrated Pest Management (IPM)
- Landscape Design Standards/Aesthetics
- Law Enforcement and Emergency Response
- Resource (Wildlife, Habitat, Cultural Resources, Public Use) Monitoring
- Visitor Services

When these step-down plans are developed, the public will be invited to assist in their development, in most instances directly through public scoping and/or workshops (to the extent legally allowed), and in all instances through public review of the plans and all supporting National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation.

1.5 CCP Review, Amendment, and Revision

The CCP is intended to be a dynamic plan based on the concept of adaptive management. Consistent with this concept, the CCP will be reviewed annually to determine whether it requires amendment or revision. The FWS will document and make minor plan modifications whenever this review, or any other monitoring or evaluation process, suggests that changes are needed to achieve the Monument's purpose, vision and goals. Modifications will be coordinated with partners and subject to appropriate NEPA compliance.

More extensive revisions of the CCP will occur when significant new information becomes available, ecological conditions change, a significant boundary change occurs, or when the need for major changes has been identified during annual plan reviews. FWS guidelines state that a revision should occur every fifteen years, although this is subject to necessity. All plan revisions will follow the procedures outlined in FWS planning policies for preparing CCPs and will require NEPA compliance. When the CCP requires a major revision, the CCP process will start anew at the preplanning phase.

1.6 Legal and Policy Guidance

The FWS is the primary federal agency responsible for conserving and enhancing the nation's fish and wildlife populations and their habitats. Although the FWS shares this responsibility with other federal agencies; tribal, state and local governments; and private entities, the FWS has specific responsibilities for migratory birds, threatened and endangered species, and certain anadromous fish (e.g., lamprey, which is not listed as threatened and endangered). The FWS also has similar management responsibilities for refuge lands, the lands and waters of which it administers to support the conservation and enhancement of fish and wildlife.

The FWS manages approximately 165,000 acres of the Monument under permit from the DOE. The FWS-administered portion of the Monument is managed under the legal and policy guidelines of the NWRS. Guidance is provided by the Presidential Proclamation, as well as other FWS policy, federal laws, executive orders, and international treaties, including treaties with Native American tribes. A partial list of laws and executive orders that affect or may affect the Monument or the FWS's implementation of the CCP is provided in Appendix D.

1.6.1 Tribal Rights and Interests

The Presidential Proclamation regarding the Monument states: "Nothing in this proclamation shall enlarge or diminish the rights of any Indian tribe." The application of tribal treaty rights has been discussed at many levels during meetings with tribes as part of the CCP process. Although the tribes and the FWS discussed tribal treaty rights, the FWS believes that defining the application of treaty rights is outside the scope of this CCP. The FWS will continue meeting with area tribes independent of the CCP process to develop memorandums of understanding (MOUs) and other instruments that are respectful of the rights and needs of the tribes, in accordance with FWS tribal policies, and consistent with preserving the natural and cultural resources of the Monument.

There is a unique and distinctive relationship between the United States and Native American governments—as defined by treaties, statutes, court decisions, and the United States Constitution—that differentiates Native American sovereign governments from other interests and constituencies. Several tribes have historically occupied or used portions of the Monument. The Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation (Yakama Nation), Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR), and Nez Perce Tribe all have treaties negotiated with the United States government (see Appendix D). The Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (CCT) are a federally recognized tribe, some of whose constituent tribes or bands are descendants of people who used the area. In addition, the Wanapum, which did not negotiate a treaty with the United States, also historically occupied and used this area and maintain traditional connections to the Monument to this day.

Through these treaties, the tribes retained certain lands for exclusive use (the four reservations) and also retained the rights to continue traditional activities outside the reservations. These reserved rights include the rights to fish at “usual and accustomed places”—the taking of fish applies to the Hanford Reach. Additional rights included those to hunt, gather foods and medicines, and pasture livestock on open and unclaimed lands.

Tribal access to those portions of the Monument managed by the FWS under DOE permit for gathering and other traditional practices is guided by the FWS Native American Policy. The FWS will seek to develop agreements with each tribe for addressing tribal access to areas for foods, collection of medicines and other resources, traditional practices, and other tribal concerns, subject to DOE approval. Tribal access to DOE-managed portions of the Monument is managed under DOE policy.

The existing FWS Native American Policy, Executive Order (EO) 13175, and legislation provides guidance for directing on-going consultation. The Native American Policy, in particular, assists the FWS in accomplishing its mission of resource protection while also guiding the federal government’s interactions with tribes to:

. . . assist Native Americans in protecting, conserving and utilizing their reserved guarantee of statutorily identified trust resources. The Service will consult with Native American governments on fish and wildlife resource matters of mutual interest and concern to keep Native American governments involved in such matters from initiation to completion of related Service activities. . . . The Service will continue to involve Native American governments in all Service actions that may affect cultural or religious interests, including archaeological sites. The Service is guided by such legislation as the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, the Native American Graves Protection Act, the National Historic Preservation Act, the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and Archaeological Resources Protection Act.

1.6.2 Valid Existing Rights

Some federal lands underlying the Monument or within the area covered by this CCP (e.g., Columbia River islands) are owned by the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), BOR, or ACOE. In addition to acquiring private lands, the Hanford Site was created by withdrawing public land; the AEC entered into agreements with the BLM and BOR to obtain management responsibility for certain withdrawn and acquired lands held by these two agencies. According to a White House background paper on the Monument's creation, "these arrangements are not altered by the proclamation, but all agreements should be reviewed for consistency with the Monument" (Monument Proclamation White House Background Paper).

The mix of jurisdictions, management and uses of Monument lands are the basis for the valid existing rights described in the Monument Proclamation: "The establishment of this monument is subject to valid existing rights." This reflects the President's intention to honor rights that existed within the boundaries of the Monument prior to its establishment on June 9, 2000. Valid existing rights vary, but the details of each one are specified in the authorizing document. The exercise of such rights can, however, be managed to protect the purposes of the Monument.

The following sections describe six main categories of valid existing rights and discuss how they will be addressed in future management.

1.6.2.1 DOE Remediation and Restoration

As a result of decades of weapons material production and military use of the area, the Hanford Site is one of the largest National Priority List (NPL)⁷ sites in the country. One of the current primary missions of the Richland Office of the DOE is cleanup and remediation of the Hanford Site. Under the Monument Proclamation, the Monument designation has no effect on the responsibility of the DOE for hazardous waste cleanup or restoration of natural resources. The DOE continues to be responsible for cleanup, restoration activities, security, safety and emergency preparedness. The DOE will manage lands within the Monument that are not subject to management agreements with the FWS under its existing authorities and consistent with the purposes of the Monument.

1.6.2.2 Mineral Rights (Including Oil and Gas)

The Monument Proclamation withdrew all federal lands and interests in lands within the Monument from entry, location, selection, sale, leasing, or other disposition under the public

⁷ Sometimes referred to as "Superfund."

land laws. This includes, but is not limited to, withdrawal from location, entry and patent under the mining laws and withdrawal from disposition under all laws relating to mineral and geothermal leasing, other than by exchange that furthers the protective purposes of the Monument. Thus, the withdrawal prevents the location of new mining claims under the 1872 Mining Law and prevents the Secretary of the Interior from exercising discretion under the mineral leasing acts and related laws to lease or sell federal minerals within the boundaries of the Monument.

Within the Monument there is only one existing privately held mineral right. This mineral right, located on portions of three sections of land in the east end of the ALE (1,280 acres), is held by the Big Bend Alberta Mining Company. The AEC acquired the surface title to this acreage by condemnation in 1952, but the company retains its right to explore for oil and gas.⁸

1.6.2.3 Columbia Basin Reclamation Project and Columbia River Transmission System

The Presidential Proclamation states: “Nothing in this proclamation shall interfere with the operation and maintenance of existing facilities of the Columbia Basin Reclamation Project, the Federal Columbia River Transmission System, or other existing utility services that are located within the Monument. Existing Federal Columbia River Transmission System facilities located within the Monument may be replaced, modified, or expanded, and new facilities constructed within the Monument, as authorized by other applicable law. Such replacement, modification, expansion, or construction of new facilities shall be carried out in a manner consistent with proper care and management of the objects of this proclamation.” Additionally, Columbia Basin Project irrigation canals, water return canals, and ponds are located within the Monument. The FWS will work closely with these entities to protect Monument resources and develop management agreements as appropriate.

1.6.2.4 State of Washington Wildlife Management

The FWS has primary jurisdiction of fish and wildlife on Monument lands as established through a variety of laws, policies and directives related to migratory and resident fish and wildlife resources on federal lands. However, fish and wildlife resources in the state of Washington belong to the residents of the state. The Monument Proclamation states: “Nothing in this proclamation shall be deemed to enlarge or diminish the jurisdiction of the State of

⁸ The Big Bend Alberta Mining Company holds all the oil and mineral rights on the northeast 1/4 of Section 1 in Township 10N, Range 26E; Section 27; and all of Section 35 except the southwest 1/4 in Township 11N, Range 26E.

Washington with respect to fish and wildlife management.” This is consistent with the Improvement Act, which states in part, “Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the several States to manage, control, or regulate fish and resident wildlife under State law or regulations in any area within the [NWRS]. Regulations permitting hunting or fishing of fish and resident wildlife within the [NWRS] shall be, to the extent practicable, consistent with State fish and wildlife laws, regulations, and management plans.”

The Monument is part of the NWRS; federal management activity involving migratory birds and other wildlife residing on units of the NWRS is a federal function specifically authorized by Congress. It is therefore for the Secretary of Interior to determine whether units of the NWRS shall be open to public uses, such as hunting and fishing, and on what terms such access shall be granted. However, in recognition of the existing jurisdictional relationship between the states and the federal government, Congress has directed that, to the maximum extent practicable, such public uses shall be consistent with state laws and regulations (43 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] 24.4). Consistent with the Improvement Act, the Director of the FWS will “interact, coordinate, cooperate and collaborate with state fish and wildlife agencies in a timely and effective manner on the acquisition and management of national wildlife refuges” (Director’s Order Number 148).

1.6.2.5 Columbia River Use

Management of the Columbia River is a complex interaction of federal and state law, federal and state agencies, and national and international policies. Management of the Columbia River is outside the scope of this CCP. However, there are several specific points that must be recognized as the CCP is developed and implemented.

- The Columbia River is navigable. Therefore, water within the Columbia River is held in trust by the state of Washington under its hybrid appropriations system; withdrawals are subject to state law.
- The Presidential Proclamation did nothing to change ownership.
- River flows have been established through a host of other venues and processes, and altering flows is outside the scope of this CCP.
- The Proclamation “reserves in the portion of the Columbia River within the boundaries of the Monument, subject to valid existing rights and as of the date of the proclamation, sufficient water to fulfill the purposes for which the Monument is established.”⁹

⁹ The FWS has no current plan to file for water rights.

1.6.2.6 Communication Sites and Local Utilities

Prior to the establishment of the Monument, the DOE authorized the use of public lands for roads, underground cables, electrical transmission structures, communication facilities, and other utility-related features. Some of these authorizations may include valid existing rights. These authorizations, where they are determined to be a valid existing right, will be recognized on the Monument, and their uses will be allowed, subject to the terms and conditions of the authorizing document. While the FWS will not eliminate valid rights, the exercise of such rights may be managed to protect the purposes of the Monument. Where a use conflicts with the protection of Monument resources, and where legally possible, the FWS will work with rights holders to implement appropriate measures to protect Monument resources through the adjustment of the underlying authorization (leases, permits, easements, etc.). Where the FWS has jurisdiction over a use, a compatibility determination may be required (see the Glossary, Appendix A, for the definition of a compatibility determination). For uses specifically authorized for a period longer than ten years, the use is subject to a compatibility determination at the time of initial application and at the time a term expires and the FWS receives a request for renewal.

1.6.3 National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act

The Improvement Act amends the Refuge System Administration Act of 1966 by defining a unifying mission for all national wildlife refuges, including a new process for determining compatible uses on refuges and requiring that each refuge be managed under a CCP. The Improvement Act expressly states that wildlife conservation is the priority of NWRS lands and that the Secretary of the Interior shall ensure that the biological integrity, diversity and environmental health of refuge lands is maintained. Each refuge must be managed to fulfill the NWRS mission and the specific purposes for which the refuge was established. The first priority of each national wildlife refuge is to conserve, manage and, if needed, restore fish and wildlife populations and habitats according to its purpose.

The Improvement Act requires that a CCP be completed for each refuge by the year 2012, and that the public have an opportunity for active involvement in plan development and revision. It is FWS policy that CCPs are developed in an open public process; the agency is committed to securing public input throughout the process.

1.6.4 American Antiquities Act

The Monument was created under the authorities granted the President by the American Antiquities Act of 1906, which states “. . . the President of the United States is hereby authorized, in his discretion, to declare by public proclamation historic landmarks, historic and

prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest . . . to be national monuments, and may reserve as a part thereof parcels of land. . . .”

Although a national monument, in creating the Monument President Clinton noted that : “The [FWS] manages lands under its management jurisdiction pursuant to the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act . . .” (White House Background Paper). That is, the Monument was to be administered as a component of the NWRS. A July 26, 2000, memorandum from Interior Secretary Babbitt further clarified that the Monument was to be administered as a national wildlife refuge: “Pursuant to the terms of the management agreements [between the DOE and FWS] and the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act, these areas are units of the National Wildlife Refuge System.”

In short, although it is a national monument, the Monument is also a component of the NWRS; the provisions of both the NWRS and the American Antiquities Act apply. In the event of a conflict between the two, the more protective provision applies. Since the Monument is both a national monument and a national wildlife refuge, the resources covered by each designation must be protected.

1.6.5 National Wildlife Refuge System and Policies

The mission of the National Wildlife Refuge System is:

To administer a national network of lands and waters for the conservation, management, and where appropriate, restoration of the fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats within the United States for the benefit of present and future generations of Americans. (16 USC § 668dd et seq.)

The NWRS has grown to include more than ninety-five million acres and nearly 550 national wildlife refuges. The NWRS is the largest collection of lands specifically managed for fish and wildlife conservation in the nation. The needs of wildlife and their habitats come first on refuges, in contrast to most other public lands which are managed for multiple uses.

The administration, management and growth of the NWRS are guided by the following goals.

- To fulfill a statutory duty to achieve refuge purpose(s) and further the NWRS mission.
- To conserve, restore where appropriate, and enhance all species of fish, wildlife and plants that are endangered or threatened with becoming endangered.
- To perpetuate migratory bird, interjurisdictional fish, and marine mammal populations.

- To conserve a diversity of fish, wildlife and plants.
- To conserve and restore, where appropriate, representative ecosystems of the United States, including the ecological processes characteristic of those ecosystems.
- To foster understanding and instill appreciation of native fish, wildlife and plants, and their conservation, by providing the public with safe, high-quality and compatible wildlife-dependent public use. Such use includes hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation.

1.6.6 Public Use of the Monument

The first priority of the NWRS is to protect the biological resources entrusted to the FWS and the irreplaceable cultural resources found within the NWRS. However, wherever possible and compatible with resource protection, a national wildlife refuge should be open and available to the public for its use and enjoyment. Consistent with the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act, the FWS makes a special effort to provide wildlife-dependent public use opportunities across the NWRS. Balancing these often-conflicting goals is accomplished through a variety of means, including the development of CCPs.

To determine what uses can be allowed on a national wildlife refuge, the FWS first determines whether the use is appropriate. For this CCP, Monument staff applied a series of questions/standards to help the Monument Project Leader determine whether a use was appropriate (see Appendix H). If the activity was determined to be an appropriate use of the Monument, the FWS developed what are known as compatibility determinations (CDs). These CDs determine whether the proposed activity is compatible with the Monument's purposes and the mission of the NWRS. Only if the activity is determined compatible with resource protection by the Monument Project Leader, with concurrence by the Region 1 Chief of Refuges, may it be allowed to occur. The CDs for the Monument are presented in Appendix I.

1.6.7 Authority to Plan for DOE Lands in the Monument

The Monument Proclamation established the authority of the FWS to write a management plan for the Monument (Appendix C). As stated in the Presidential Proclamation for the Monument:

The monument shall be managed by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service under existing agreements with the Department of Energy, except that the Department of Energy shall manage the lands within the monument that are not subject to management agreements with the Service, and in developing any management plans and rules and regulations governing the portions of the monument for which the Department of Energy has

management responsibility, the Secretary of Energy shall consult with the Secretary of the Interior.

As the Department of Energy and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service determine that lands within the monument managed by the Department of Energy become suitable for management by the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service will assume management by agreement with the Department of Energy. All agreements between the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the Department of Energy shall be consistent with the provisions of this proclamation.

All lands included in the Monument are federal lands under the primary jurisdiction of the DOE. Under agreement with the DOE, the FWS manages the ALE (eastern portion of the Rattlesnake Unit) and most of the Monument lands north of the river—including the Wahluke, Ringold and Saddle Mountain Units—and the shorelines of the Columbia River Corridor Unit in Franklin and Grant Counties to the east of the Vernita Bridge.¹⁰ The DOE manages the balance of the Monument, including the western end of the Rattlesnake Unit and the remainder of the Columbia River Corridor Unit (west of the Vernita Bridge in Grant County, all of the Benton County shoreline, and the Hanford Dune Field). The DOE intends to manage its portion of the Monument consistent with existing regulatory agreements regarding cleanup of the Hanford Site (Hanford Federal Facility Agreement and Consent Order),¹¹ the Hanford Comprehensive Land-Use Plan (DOE 1999, 64 Federal Register [FR] 61615), the Monument Proclamation (65 FR 37253).

1.6.7.1 Protection of Additional DOE Lands

The same day President Clinton created the Monument, he sent a memorandum to the Secretary of Energy, Bill Richardson, declaring that the DOE “manage the central area to protect these important values [shrub-steppe habitat and other objects of scientific and historic interest] where practical.” The President further directed the Secretary of Energy “to consult with the Secretary of the Interior on how best to permanently protect these objects, including the possibility of adding lands to the monument as they are remediated.”

1.6.8 DOE Goals, Existing Land Use Plan and Policies

It is DOE policy (DOE Land and Facility Use Policy, DOE P430.1 December 21, 1994b) to manage all of its land and facilities as valuable national resources. The DOE’s stewardship is

¹⁰ Please refer to Chapter 2 for a description of the new management units.

¹¹ Adopted by the Washington Department of Ecology, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and DOE in 1989.

based on the principles of ecosystem management and sustainable development. The DOE integrates mission, ecological, social and cultural factors at each site in a comprehensive plan that guides land and facility use decisions. Each comprehensive plan considers the site's larger regional context and is developed with stakeholder participation. The DOE policy results in land and facility uses that support its critical missions and protect the environment.

At the Hanford Site, the DOE completed the *Final Comprehensive Land Use Plan Environmental Impact Statement* (CLUP) in 1999 with the assistance of nine cooperating agencies, including the FWS. The CLUP is subject to five-year reviews by the DOE, and it is still the active plan for DOE-controlled portions of the Hanford Site, including FWS-managed portions of the Monument. The CLUP will remain in effect until such time as jurisdiction is transferred to another entity or is superseded by the adoption of this CCP or another DOE plan.¹²

1.7 Monument Purpose

The Monument was established to protect “antiquities” and to set aside lands for scientific purposes. The Presidential Proclamation regarding the Monument defines the reasons the Monument was established and the purposes for which it is to be managed. The Monument Proclamation is unusual in its level of detail and is very specific as to those resources deemed nationally significant. The resources specifically mentioned include:

- A shrub-steppe ecosystem, including breeding populations of steppe and shrub-steppe dependent birds such as loggerhead shrikes, sage sparrows, sage thrashers, and ferruginous hawks.
- Water-related resources, including 46.5 miles of the 51-mile-long Hanford Reach of the Columbia River, fall Chinook salmon spawning areas, and sturgeon.
- A diversity of native plant and animal species, including rare and sensitive plant species such as Umtanum desert buckwheat and White Bluffs bladderpod; habitat for migratory birds, as well as resident species, including wintering habitat for bald eagles, white pelicans, and ducks; nesting sites for rare bird species, including prairie and peregrine falcons; mammals, including elk, beaver, badgers, and bobcats; and insect species new to science or not previously identified in the state of Washington.
- Microbiotic crusts.

¹² The DOE, as cooperating federal agency, will have the opportunity to prepare a ROD adopting CCP/EIS decisions for those Monument lands under its management.

- Significant geological and paleontological objects, such as the White Bluffs and Hanford Dune Field, and mammalian fossils of rhinoceros, camel, mastodon and others.
- Important archaeological and historic artifacts from more than 10,000 years of human occupation, including prehistoric pit houses, graves, spirit quest monuments, hunting camps, game drive complexes, quarries, hunting and kill sites, and more recent human activity such as homesteads and early towns.

The Monument Proclamation also sets forth specific management actions that are to be followed, establishing a basis for management of the Monument. In addition, it sets forth the following mechanisms for protection of the significant resources found in the Monument.

- Federal lands are withdrawn from disposition under public land laws. This includes all interests in these lands, such as future mining claims.
- Off-road vehicle use is prohibited.
- The ability to apply for water rights is established.
- Grazing is prohibited.
- The FWS and DOE (subject to certain provisions) are established as the managers of the Monument.
- A land management transfer mechanism from the DOE to the FWS is established.
- Clean-up and restoration activities are assured.
- Existing rights, including tribal rights, are protected.

1.8 Vision for the Hanford Reach National Monument

One of the first steps in writing specific management direction for any refuge is creation of a vision statement. A vision statement is a "... concise statement of what the planning unit should be, or what we hope to do, based primarily upon the [NWRS] mission and specific refuge purposes, and other mandates" (602 FW 1.6). At its core, the vision statement describes how the Monument should look in the future and outlines resource management and public use. It provides a sense of direction and something for which to strive.

The vision statement establishes the groundwork for the creation of management goals and objectives. Goals are the first step in identifying specific management actions; they identify and focus management priorities and provide a link between management actions, the Monument Proclamation, legal requirements, and FWS policies and procedures. Goals work towards realizing the Monument's vision and purposes, providing the framework for sound and defensible management decisions. Objectives are incremental steps taken to achieve a goal. They derive from goals and provide a foundation for determining implementation strategies, monitoring refuge accomplishments, and evaluating success. Objectives should be specific, measurable, achievable, results-oriented, and time-fixed.

The FWS solicited the assistance of the public, cooperating agencies, tribal governments, and the Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee (FAC; described in Section 1.10.1) in developing its vision, goals and objectives. As the result of numerous meetings and a series of three public workshops, a vision statement, ten management goals, and an initial list of objectives were established. Below is the vision the Monument will follow for at least the next fifteen years. Goals and objectives can be found in Chapter 2, where they provide details for the alternatives under consideration.

The Monument's long-term vision:

The Hanford Reach National Monument is a biologically diverse landscape, embracing a remarkable natural and historic legacy. The Hanford Reach, the last free-flowing non-tidal stretch of the Columbia River, is the ribbon that weaves shrub-steppe and riverine communities together, defining an irreplaceable landscape—a place to discover the richness of life, to reflect upon history, and to experience nature in solitude.

The Monument's diversity of plants and wildlife is critical to the biological integrity of the Columbia Basin. The unique combination of an expansive and increasingly rare shrub-steppe ecosystem, the free-flowing river, and the last major salmon spawning grounds in the Columbia River create a diverse and precious mosaic of habitats. The Monument is a refuge for a multitude of species, many new to science.

The Monument is a natural gathering place to learn, experience, and celebrate cultures, a place where stories are protected and passed on. Its history of immigrant settlement and the dawning of the atomic era is acknowledged, as well as its continuing physical and spiritual sustenance for the Native Americans who have used the area and the people who came later. The Monument is a testimonial to the past and the sacrifices of our ancestors. The Monument is also a vision into the future where visitors, neighbors, and partners are valued and respected; natural and historic resources are protected; and all may come to experience the Monument and its magnificent resources.

1.9 FWS Coordination With Other Governments, Agencies and Organizations

The CCP for the Monument is intended to meet coordination requirements of the Improvement Act and other pertinent laws, policies and directives. The associated EIS fulfills compliance with the NEPA. All require that the FWS actively seek public involvement and tribal input in the preparation of environmental documents. The NEPA also requires that the FWS seriously consider all reasonable alternatives, including the “No Action Alternative,” which represents continuation of current conditions and management practices. The overall CCP process is guided by the Refuge Planning Chapter of FWS Refuge Manual 602 FW 3, 2000.

1.9.1 Hanford Reach National Monument Federal Planning Advisory Committee

Following the signing of the Monument Proclamation, the Secretary of the Interior established the FAC to provide advice to the FWS on a management plan for the newly established Monument. The initial FAC charter for a two-year period was approved in 2001, with thirteen members appointed to represent diverse stakeholder interests in the Monument planning process (see Appendix G). The FAC charter was renewed in 2003 for an additional two years. The 2003 charter expanded membership to nineteen positions; however, the new positions were not filled prior to the expiration of the FAC charter on January 10, 2005.

Although the FAC charter has expired, prior to its expiration the FAC was instrumental in developing the draft CCP. The FAC provided advice on the Monument’s vision, the range of alternatives, management goals and objectives, the CCP process, and a multitude of controversial issues. The FWS also invited the FAC to provide input on what their preferred alternative might look like; the FAC’s input is reflected in Alternative E.

1.9.2 Tribal Consultation

The FWS and DOE are required to consult with Native American tribal governments prior to taking any action with potential impact on American Indian nations. Meaningful and timely communication and coordination with tribes helps determine management concerns and identify opportunities and impacts related to traditional and cultural life ways and natural resources, as well as respects and preserves treaty and other reserved rights.

Coordination with the treaty and other tribes on the CCP began in August 2001 with an initial meeting with the CTUIR. In March 2002, the FWS sent a letter to each concerned tribe formally

inviting them to participate in the CCP process. Several subsequent meetings were held with technical staff from the CCT, CTUIR, Nez Perce Tribe, and Yakama Nation, as well as the Wanapum, during the planning process. Tribal representatives were invited to—and several tribes participated in—planning workshops and resource reviews held in 2002 and 2003.¹³ Monument staff traveled to, and gave presentations to, the Yakama Nation, CTUIR, Nez Perce Tribe, and CCT, seeking tribal input and concerns and providing updates related to plan goals, objectives and alternatives. Several efforts were made to provide a presentation to the Wanapum; however, tribal emergencies led to their cancellation. A list of these meetings can be found in Chapter 5.

1.9.3 Cooperating Agencies/Consulting Tribal Governments

Coordination among participating agencies, tribes and other levels of government is a fundamental element of the CCP process. A team of eleven cooperating agencies and representatives from three tribes was established to obtain technical expertise and assistance in writing the CCP and EIS.¹⁴ Chapter 5 provides additional details on coordination. The cooperating/consulting interests are:

- Adams County.
- Benton County.
- Bonneville Power Administration.
- Bureau of Reclamation.
- Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation.
- Department of Energy.
- Grant County.
- Nez Perce Tribe.
- Richland (City).
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
- Washington Department of Ecology.
- Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife.
- Washington Department of Natural Resources.
- Yakama Nation.

¹³ The FWS and DOE recognize that the participation of tribal staff at public meetings and workshops does not constitute government-to-government consultation with tribes. The public process is distinct and separate from the agencies' responsibility to have meaningful and timely dialogue with tribal leaders on matters that will affect tribal affairs or resources.

¹⁴ The initial team comprised eight agencies and one consulting tribe in 2002; the other members joined as the process progressed.

1.9.4 Public Involvement and Scoping

Public involvement was given considerable attention in the Monument's CCP process. Public involvement began with a Notice of Intent published in the *Federal Register* on June 12, 2002, notifying the public of the start of the formal planning process. A series of four public scoping meetings—Mattawa, Seattle, Richland and Yakima, Washington—were held in August and September 2002 to gather comments on issues to be addressed in the CCP. A planning workbook was produced and distributed to aid participants in preparing comments, and a scoping report was prepared in early 2003. To date, Monument staff have given dozens of presentations to a variety of recreational, economic development, sport, civic, governmental, environmental and other groups. Tools used to encourage public involvement included public meetings, planning update newsletters, workbooks, workshops, presentations, web pages, and *Federal Register* notices. Chapter 5 provides additional details, including those related to the public review of the Draft CCP.

1.10 Issues, Concerns, and Opportunities

The planning team evaluated the issues and topics documented during the scoping and resource review processes. **Issues** are defined as matters of controversy, dispute, or general concern over resource management activities, the environment, or land uses. Issues are important because they identify topics to be addressed in the plan, pinpoint the types of information to gather, and help define alternatives for the plan. Numerous issues, concerns and opportunities were raised, and all are addressed in some manner in the CCP. It is the FWS's responsibility to focus planning and the EIS analysis on the major issues. Major issues typically suggest different actions or alternative solutions and are typically those within Monument jurisdiction. Major issues will influence the decisions proposed in the plan. The major issues, concerns and opportunities are presented in the sections that follow.

1.10.1 Biological Resources

How will the biological resources be managed, protected, enhanced and/or restored?

The Monument contains one of the last remaining large areas of native plant communities and habitats within the Columbia Basin. Unique to this area are remnant plant communities with intact microbiotic crusts that are inhabited by approximately 1,500 distinct species—forty-one of which are new to science—including many sagebrush-obligate and rare species (e.g., Umtanum desert buckwheat, White Bluffs bladderpod). Large mammals, such as elk and mule deer, inhabit areas of the Monument.

Shrub-steppe plant communities (e.g., bitterbrush/Indian ricegrass and big sagebrush/bluebunch wheatgrass) found in the Monument are regionally significant and are rapidly disappearing in eastern Washington. One of the primary threats to the diversity associated with native plant species and communities present in the Monument is the introduction and spread of non-native, invasive species (e.g., spotted knapweed). The primary means by which invasive species have and will continue to infest the Monument is through establishment following disturbances such as wildfire, road construction or maintenance, utility rights-of-way upkeep, and off-road travel. Wind and vehicles are the primary mechanisms of dispersal.

Because of the degradation of the shrub-steppe habitat, the natural fire interval has been significantly decreased. Increased fire frequency and the spread of a cheatgrass understory (an introduced species) will continue to increase the loss of the remnant habitat to catastrophic fires.

A major management issue regarding shrub-steppe is the restoration of communities on the Monument and connection with those on adjacent lands. Large intact areas of shrub-steppe habitat improve ecosystem functionality and provide improved support for shrub-steppe obligate species. Approximately 50% of Monument lands may require some degree of restoration activity to restore proper functioning conditions.

1.10.2 Fisheries

What actions can be taken to protect fisheries?

Fishery resources are abundant within the Hanford Reach, with the fall Chinook salmon stock as the most important fishery resource to commercial and recreational fishers and area tribes.¹⁵ Salmon populations and their utilization of the Hanford Reach are well documented. Federally listed upper Columbia River steelhead, as well as hatchery steelhead, also utilize the Hanford Reach. Fall and summer Chinook, hatchery steelhead, sturgeon and mountain whitefish all provide economically valuable fisheries and subsistence fisheries for the tribes.

The health of fishery resources that use the Hanford Reach depends on water quality, quality of riparian habitat, and protection of critical spawning and rearing habitat. Much of the native in-river habitat remains intact for several valuable species. However, construction of dams on the Columbia River has resulted in significant losses of mainstem spawning habitat, which is the primary reason 80% of the existing mainstem Columbia River fall Chinook stock spawn and rear within the Hanford Reach.

¹⁵ Fishing rights are among the most significant of all tribal treaty rights, especially with the Boldt decision recognizing the right of the tribes to 50% of the salmon return.

The fisheries resources can be improved through a number of measures, including restoring riparian habitat, designing river flows to benefit fish, assuring prudent harvest allocation, supplementing hatcheries, and reducing sources of contaminants from off-site sources. While the only measure directly within the scope of Monument management is riparian habitat, other objectives should support existing management forums and federal, state and Native American fisheries management goals, which are essential components of effective fisheries management of the Hanford Reach.

1.10.3 Cultural Resources

How will cultural resources be protected?

Cultural resources within and adjacent to the Monument are both extensive and diverse and were a significant contributor towards establishing the Monument. These resources include a cultural record of Native American use spanning more than 12,000 years, including evidence of use of arid lowlands for fishing, hunting, hunting camps, game drive complexes, and game processing sites. Early European settlement of the area is well documented and of significance regionally. The historic buildings and structures, including industrial and operational artifacts, associated with the Manhattan Project and the Cold War are extensive and internationally renowned.

Once lost, these resources can never be replaced, and there are numerous threats to cultural resources. Cultural material continues to be exposed by erosion. Biological restoration can affect cultural resources. Public access and use could also adversely affect culturally sensitive sites, resources currently used by Native American, and Native American traditional use of the area, through direct disruption, intrusion, fire, vandalism, looting, spread of weeds, etc.

One protection plan does not fit all sites and resources. Architectural resources may benefit from public visitation while archaeological resources may be more fragile or have sensitivity issues associated. Balancing use of the Monument with resource protection will be addressed through a subsequent step-down plan.

1.10.4 Geological and Paleontological Resources

How will geological and paleontological resources be protected?

There are numerous threats to the Monument's unique and irreplaceable geological and paleontological resources, such as illegal collection and illegal off-road vehicle use. Many other threats have collateral consequences to other resources. The slumping of the White Bluffs causes major adverse impacts on the geological and paleontological resources in both the bluffs and the river corridor. Fossil resources in landslides erode from the White Bluffs and sometimes

fall into the channel, altering stratigraphic sequence. Bluff slumping threatens salmon spawning beds, bird nesting habitat, riparian habitat zones, water quality, and the Monument's aesthetic/scenic resources. Increased erosion of Locke Island has resulted in degradation of the archaeological resources of the island, creating a substantial loss of local Native American cultural heritage. A restoration plan for sites with severe and unnatural erosion is needed.¹⁶

1.10.5 Contaminants

How will contamination issues be addressed?

Contaminants on and adjacent to the Monument originate from several sources, including past Hanford Site nuclear material production activities, past agricultural activities, current Hanford remediation activities, return waters from the Columbia Basin Irrigation Project, and a variety of past and present uses occurring upriver (e.g., mining, agriculture, municipal/industrial discharges).

Several legally mandated processes—such as the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA); state hazardous waste laws; the Clean Water Act; and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act—are in place to address contaminant remediation and the accepted use of industrial and agricultural chemicals. The Monument designation does not affect the responsibility of the DOE and other responsible parties to comply with applicable environmental laws to remediate hazardous substances and restore natural resources on Monument lands and waters. However, opportunities may be available to benefit the Monument by working with local, state and federal agencies and tribes on various contaminant-related issues, such as cleanup of hazardous waste, review of permits, and the collection of information. Potential environmental impacts from clean-up activities are not directly addressed within this CCP; rather, current conditions, institutional controls, management actions, and agency roles and responsibilities are described and accounted for within the planning time frame.

In 1989, the EPA placed portions of the Hanford Site on the NPL under the CERCLA. Since then, most lands within the Monument boundaries have been removed from the NPL, except for the 1/4-mile-wide Benton County shoreline of the Columbia River and the nearby sand dunes. The south shoreline, administered by the DOE, with its nuclear reactors in and adjacent to the Monument, is the focus of accelerated cleanup efforts. Safety and security concerns related to

¹⁶ Slumping of the White Bluffs is occurring due to excess irrigation water diverted to ponds and unlined canals behind the bluffs that is seeping down to the Ringold Formation (Bjornstad 2006a). Once water encounters the impermeable Ringold Formation it moves laterally toward the bluffs, where the water seeps out along the bluffs and slumping occurs. This activity is beyond the control of the FWS since a number of federal and state agencies need to agree on the problem and address it together.

contaminants and cleanup activities may require some of the south shoreline to remain closed to public access.

Within the CERCLA de-listed Monument lands (areas north of the river, the Rattlesnake Unit, and the area south and west of the Vernita Bridge in the Columbia River Corridor Unit), several small sites of concern have been identified by the FWS as having potential contaminant and/or safety concerns for which special management actions, including public access restrictions, may be required under the lead of the DOE.

Return flows from agricultural irrigation transport water into the Monument and the Columbia River. This agricultural drainage and run-off has created lakes, ponds, streams/ditches, and wetlands on the Monument. Contaminant concerns within that return flow may require restrictive management actions for public safety. Similarly, additional investigation and monitoring of natural resources in the Columbia River and its riparian zone may indicate the need for restrictive management actions resulting from contaminant-related effects.

A recent U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) advisory (EPA Advisory #4570) raised human health concerns related to PCB contaminants and consumption of fish taken from the lower Columbia River (well below the Hanford Reach). Other fish consumption advisories have also been issued, such as the 2003 state-wide bass consumption advisory due to increased mercury levels.

The Monument supports a number of Native American foods and medicines and contains sacred places important to tribal cultures. The tribes hope to safely use these resources in the future and require assurance that the environment is clean and healthy. Tribal and/or public access and consumption restrictions may be required in certain areas until potential threats are eliminated or reduced.

1.10.6 Elk Management

How will the elk population be managed on the Monument?

The need for elk population control/herd management has been discussed for several years among the FWS, WDFW, DOE, tribes, local governments, and private landowners, primarily to meet state population goals. While the WDFW's *Rattlesnake Hills Elk Management Plan* identifies a population goal of less than 350 elk, the herd has ranged from 450 to more than 800 animals over the last nine years. While effective in the short term, trapping on the Monument and relocation to suitable sites, combined with special and extended hunting seasons established by the WDFW on adjacent lands, has not reduced this herd to the target level. Damage to adjacent agricultural crops, with the resultant damage claims, has resulted in an increased interest in conducting active management of the herd in the Monument. Population control

measures may use both lethal and nonlethal methods, such as trapping and relocating; government culling; hazing; permitted and controlled hunting; and/or contraception. A single measure or a combination of measures may be implemented in coordination with landowners, DOE, WDFW, and/or tribes to reduce populations to a level that is consistent with WDFW management goals. Background information on elk is provided in Chapter 3.

1.10.7 Visitor Use

What recreation activities and interpretation and education programs are appropriate and where will they occur?

The Monument provides recreational and educational opportunities on the nation's last remaining non-tidal, free-flowing stretch of the Columbia River and in associated shrub-steppe settings. The Monument's outstanding biological and geological resources, panoramic scenery, and opportunities for solitude contribute to quality recreational opportunities. In addition to natural resources, educational opportunities arise from the Monument's wealth of cultural resources associated with Native American use, post-European settlement, the Manhattan Project, and the Cold War. The natural and cultural resources, including historical events with world-wide consequences, provide opportunities for people to visit and recreate in a setting that is not duplicated anywhere.

Traditional recreational activities include fishing, hunting, boating, wildlife and scenic viewing, hiking, horseback riding, and bicycling. Current recreation use is light to moderate, except during fall salmon fishing when river access points are heavily congested. Under permit from the DOE, the FWS allows the public to access about 35% of the Monument year-round for day use, although this would increase substantially under the preferred alternative to almost 57% of the Monument being opened at some point. The remaining Monument lands are managed under a special-use permit system that provides access only for approved educational and research purposes.

Visitor amenities are currently few. Visitor facilities consist of gravel and dirt roads, small parking areas, primitive boat ramps, and directional signing. There are a few commercial guide services offering fishing, hunting and sightseeing excursions.

Maintaining traditional recreation activities is important to many people. A number of people want expanded opportunities, such as camping, interpretation and education programs, and some people have requested improved facilities such as better roads, boat launches, trails and signing. A segment of the public wants more access to areas within the Monument that are currently closed to general public access.

An important consideration in determining the type and amount of visitor use activities is potential impacts on natural and cultural resources. Examples of recreation use impacts are wildlife and habitat disturbance, invasive species spread, removal of cultural artifacts, and human-caused wildfire. Determining which activities are appropriate for, and compatible with, the Monument; the best locations for these activities; and how the FWS can ensure adequate protection for Monument resources are just a few of the issues that must be addressed in balancing public use and access with protecting the resources of the Monument.

1.10.8 Access and Transportation

How will transportation be managed to provide access for public uses, management needs, and valid existing rights?

Transportation must be managed to provide access for management needs, valid existing rights, and public uses. Roads in particular often play a key role in providing recreational access. Studies in national parks indicate that most visitor use occurs within 1/4-mile of roads. The Monument has an extensive network of roads that was developed for different needs during different eras. Although most of these roads are unimproved, closed to the public, and rarely used even for administrative purposes, some are critical for management activities, such as utility maintenance and fire control. The road corridors unnecessary for management purposes and public use/access could be restored to a natural condition or converted to recreational trails. Other transportation corridors include the Columbia River and railroad infrastructure. Commercial guides are interested in the possibility of using boats and trains to bring visitors to the Monument. Decisions about transportation management should consider habitat impacts, historical significance, administrative needs, maintenance costs, safety and recreational needs.

1.10.9 Facilities and Infrastructure

What facilities and other infrastructure are needed and where?

Facilities for the Monument include all structures for visitors, administration and research. As a result of local community input and action, the CCP assumes a single, large-scale office/visitor center/museum is desirable and will be located outside the Monument boundaries. However, other facility-related decisions are necessary to manage the visitor use and research programs and to protect/manage the Monument's natural and cultural resources. Such decisions include determining the type and location of maintenance, visitor, research and administration facilities. For example, the observatory on the top of Rattlesnake Mountain is not part of the mission of

the FWS, and access to the facility is expensive to maintain; the future of that facility needs to be determined.¹⁷

1.10.10 FWS-Managed Lands

Which additional Monument lands are suitable and appropriate for FWS management as part of the NWRs?

There are approximately 29,000 acres of land within the Monument not currently managed by the FWS. This land and associated facilities are managed by other state and federal agencies, such as the WSDOT (Vernita Rest Area), WDFW (area north and west of the Vernita Bridge), and DOE (western end of the Rattlesnake unit, Columbia River Corridor Unit south and west of the Vernita Bridge, several Columbia River islands, the western shoreline of the Columbia River Corridor Unit, and the dune field). The Presidential Proclamation directs the Secretary of the Interior to manage the Monument through the FWS under existing authorities and agreements with the DOE. The FWS and DOE are expected to extend agreements to other lands included in the Monument that are not now managed by FWS.

1.10.11 Other Issues

Several issues were raised during the scoping process that are covered in this CCP but are not the focus of detailed analysis or not within the range of alternatives. Listed below are issues with actions that may be treated the same under all alternatives and/or addressed in the CCP goals, objectives or in subsequent step-down plans.

- Monitoring programs.
- Partnerships.
- Invasive species control.
- Selected existing structures.
- Research access.
- Connectivity of habitat with lands outside the Monument.
- Wild and scenic river eligibility.
- Fire management.
- Operations and maintenance.
- Law enforcement.
- Emergencies, security safety actions.

¹⁷ The preferred alternative recommends that the DOE remove the observatory.

1.10.12 Issues Outside the Scope of the CCP

Many issues/topics were raised by the public, other agencies/governments, or non-governmental organizations that go beyond the scope of this CCP/EIS. Many of these are being handled in other planning, government-to-government, or NEPA analyses processes. Many are the primary responsibility of other agencies. Issues raised that are outside the scope of this CCP include:

- Determining the application of certain tribal treaty rights.
- Site design and development of the visitor center for the Monument.
- Transfer of primary jurisdiction of DOE lands.
- Payment in lieu of taxes to counties.
- Columbia River flows.
- Co-management of the Monument with tribes.
- Issues related to Hanford nuclear waste and other cleanup.
- B Reactor historic significance determination and management.¹⁸
- Cultural resources on DOE lands outside the Monument.
- Recovery plans for threatened and endangered species.
- Maintenance of a long-term federal planning advisory board for the Monument.

¹⁸ The B Reactor is discussed in Chapter 3 (Section 3.20.6) as a “Special Management Consideration.” Currently, the National Park Service is studying the B Reactor and other Manhattan Project sites to determine if they should be preserved, how they should be preserved (e.g., national park, national historic site), and who should manage them (e.g., National Park Service, local governments). If the B Reactor is designated as a historic site, both the designation and the subsequent management would impact the Monument. For example, interpretive sites might be established on the Monument, or access points (e.g., boat docks, road entrances) might be located on Monument lands. However, both the designation of, and management of, the B Reactor is outside the scope of the CCP and is the responsibility of other federal agencies, i.e., the National Park Service and the DOE.